<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-39 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18-29, and 31-39 have been amended as shown on pages 3-10 of the Reply. In addition, the specification has been amended as shown on page 2. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   Rejection of Claims 1-4, 8-14, 16, 17, 20-22, 24, 26-28, and 30-38 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)

Claims 1-4, 8-14, 16, 17, 20-22, 24, 26-28, and 30-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Schaeck, *et al*. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163513). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Schaeck, *et al*. does not disclose or suggest all features set forth in the subject claims.

> For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that "each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (*quoting Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

The subject application relates generally to shared role-specific portal configurations that provide a user with selective access to networked components based on the user's defined role. A shared portal configuration can be configured with one or more windows of access known as portlets. Each portlet within the portal configuration can be associated with a particular network component, and the set of portlets presented to a user upon instantiating the portal can be based on the user's designated role (*e.g.* electrician, plumber, technician, *etc.*) (see, *e.g.*, paragraph [0013]). In this way, the user can be provided with a network access configuration appropriate to the user's job function. Moreover, in order to reduce administrative load on a system administrator, limited administrator privileges can be delineated to selected users belonging to a particular role. These limited administrator privileges can grant a user an ability to create,

11

modify, and remove shared portal configurations within the scope of the user's role (see, e.g., paragraphs [0067], [0078], and [0081]). This can allow flexible portal configuration management that reduces dependence on a system administrator. In particular, amended independent claim 1 recites, *an administrative component that **allows limited administrator privileges to be delineated to selected user profiles within the role-specific sets**, the limited administrator privileges **granting the selected user profiles an ability to create, modify, and remove shared access profiles within their respective role-specific sets***.

Schaeck, *et al.* does not disclose or suggest at least these features. Schaeck, *et al.* relates to presentation of an aggregated view of web services and sub-services to a user based on the user's role. However, while Schaeck, *et al.* discloses creation of role-specific views of a web-based service that can be utilized by the various users within their respective roles, the cited reference does not contemplate granting a user profile associated with a given role the capability to create, modify, and remove shared access profiles within the role.

In addition to the features discussed above, one or more embodiments of the present application can allow a user to customize his or her own portal configuration within the scope of the user's defined role. For example, once a user has initialized a shared portal configuration, a list of components associated with the user's role can be provided. The user can then associate any of the presented components with selected portlets within the shared configuration. In this way, individuals can create portal configurations suitable to their needs and within the scope of their designated roles (see, *e.g.*, paragraph [0017], [0052], and [0060]). In particular, amended independent claim 12 recites, *wherein the portal presents a subset of the components associated with the user role and allows a selected component from the subset to be associated with a portlet from the one or more portlets*.

Schaeck, *et al.* is silent regarding such user-configurable portals. Although Schaeck, *et al.* discloses that a user can be presented with pre-configured, role-appropriate portlets upon login, the cited reference does not contemplate allowing the user to configure a portlet by associating a particular component or service with the portlet. Rather, with regard to configuration of a portlet, the cited reference discloses only that the portlet configurations are prepared prior to a user's interaction with the portal, and that these pre-defined portlets are presented to the user upon request of a particular service. Schaeck, *et al.* does not contemplate user configuration of a portlet configuration in general, the cited reference fails to disclose

presenting a subset of components associated with a user role and *allowing a component from the subset to be selectively associated with a selected portlet.*

Similarly, amended independent claim 21 recites, *instantiating one or more portlets within the portal;* **providing a list of networked components associated with the user role, the list comprising a subset of a total number of available networked components;** *[and]* **receiving an input that associates the one or more portlets with respective networked components** *selected from the list to provide selective access to the respective networked components via the one or more portals.* As discussed *supra,* Schaeck, *et al.* fails to disclose this manner of role-based portal configuration.

Likewise, amended independent claim 26 recites, **filtering a list of total available networked components based on the user role** *to yield a role-specific list of networked components; providing the role-specific list of networked components associated with the user role; [and]* **receiving user input to customize the portal configuration by associating selected networked components from the role-specific list with the one or more portlets** *to yield a customized portal configuration.* As already noted, the cited reference does not disclose filtering a list of networked components based on user role, and allowing selected network components from the list to be associated with selected portlets.

Also, amended independent claim 33 recites, *means for* **delineating limited administrative privileges to selected user profiles associated with the user role,** *the limited administrator privileges* **granting the selected user profiles an ability to create, modify, and remove shared portal configurations associated with the user role without granting an ability to create, modify, or remove shared portal configurations associated with a disparate user role.** Schaeck, *et al.* does not disclose delineation of such role-specific administrator privileges, as noted above. Note that amended claim 35, as amended, recites similar features, and is therefore also believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 34, as amended, recites, *instructions for instantiating a portal configuration; instructions for* **filtering a list of available networked components based on a user role** *to yield a role-specific list of networked components; [and] instructions for* **receiving an input to associate selected networked components from the role-specific list** *with selected portlets within the portal configuration,* and as already noted, the cited reference fails to disclose such a role-specific portal configuration technique.

Furthermore, according to one or more embodiments of the present application, the shared access profiles described above can be associated with a particular location (e.g., building, facility, plant area, etc.) as well as a user role, such that the access profile presented to a user can be a factor of both the user's role and the user's present location. In this way, network components to which a user has access via the portals can be appropriate to the user's present location as well as the user's role or job function. To this end, amended claim 2 recites, *the respective one or more shared access profiles further associated with a location, and the retrieval component obtains the selected shared access profile in accordance with a user's role and current location.* Schaeck, *et al.* does not consider a user's location when determining an appropriate portal view to provide a user, and therefore is silent with regard to shared access profiles that are associated with a location as well as a user role.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Schaeck, *et al.* does not disclose each and every feature of amended independent claims 1, 12, 21, 26, 33, and 34 (and all claims depending there from), and as such fails to anticipate or render obvious the present invention. It is therefore requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

II.   Rejection of Claims 5, 7, 19, 23, 29, and 39 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5, 7, 19, 23, 29, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck, *et al.* in view of Hayes Jr., *et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0011341). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Schaeck, *et al.* and Hayes, Jr., *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all aspects of the subject claims.

> To reject claims in an application under § 103, an examiner must establish a prima facie case of obviousness. A prima facie case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue (*e.g.*, in the references themselves, interrelated teachings of multiple patents, the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace, or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art). To facilitate review, this analysis should be made explicit. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP §

706.02(j). See also KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 550 U.S. 398, 04-1350, slip op. at 14 (2007). The reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)

Claims 5 and 7 depend from amended independent claim 1, and as discussed in the previous section of the Reply in connection with that independent claim, Schaeck, *et al.* fails to disclose the functionality of an administrative component that allows limited administrator privileges to be delineated to selected user profiles within role-specific sets, wherein the limited administrator privileges grant the selected user profiles an ability to create, modify, and remove shared access profiles within their respective role-specific sets. Hayes, Jr., which relates to a system that manages which applications a given user is permitted to access, fails to cure these deficiencies.

Also, claims 19, 23, 29, and 39 depend from amended independent claims 12, 21, 26, and 34, respectively. In this regard, Hayes, Jr., *et al.* also fails to remedy the deficiencies of Schaeck, *et al.* with regard to the role-specific portal configuration techniques discussed above in connection with those independent claims.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Hayes, Jr., *et al.* and Schaeck, *et al.*, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all aspects of amended independent claims 1, 12, 21, 26, and 34 (and all claims depending there from), and as such fail to make obvious the present invention. It is therefore requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

III.   Rejection of Claim 6 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck, *et al.* in view of Hayes Jr., *et al.*, and further in view of Nielsen (US 5,813,007). However, claim 6 depends from amended independent claim 1, and as discussed above, Schaeck, *et al.*, and Hayes Jr., *et al.* do not disclose or suggest an administrative component that allows limited administrator privileges to be delineated to selected user profiles within role-specific sets, wherein the limited administrator privileges grant the selected user profiles an ability to create, modify, and remove shared access profiles within their respective role-specific sets, as provided by that independent claim. Nielsen, which relates to user generation of notifications upon detection of significant changes to the content of a bookmarked web page, is also silent regarding

delineation of such role-based administrative features. It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

IV.   Rejection of Claim 15 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck, *et al.* in view of Hayes Jr., *et al.*, further in view of Gilmour, *et al.* (US 6,115,709). However, claim 15 depends from amended independent claim 12. As discussed above in connection with that independent claim, Schaeck, *et al.* and Hayes Jr., *et al.* do not disclose that a role-specific portal configuration can *present a subset of the components associated with a user role and allow a component from the subset to be selectively associated with a selected portlet*. Gilmour, *et al.* fails to remedy these deficiencies. Gilmour, *et al.* relates to a technique for controlling access to portions of an electronic document based on whether the portion is deemed public or private. However, Gilmour, *et al.* does not relate generally to the use of portal configurations to access components on a network, and therefore fails to make up the shortcomings of the other cited references in this regard. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

V.   Rejection of Claims 18 and 25 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 18 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck *et al.* in view of Hayes Jr. *et al.*, further in view of Sheppard (US 6,026,397). However, claims 18 and 25 depend from amended independent claims 12 and 21, respectively. Sheppard, which relates to techniques for segmenting and clustering data records to facilitate efficient storage in a database, does not remedy the deficiencies of the other cited references with regard to presenting a subset of components associated with a user role and allowing a component from the subset to be selectively associated with a selected portlet, as set forth in those independent claims. As such, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [ALBRP318US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

TUROCY & WATSON, LLP

/Brian Steed/
Brian Steed
Reg. No. 64,095

TUROCY & WATSON, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731